

REMARKS

Claims 20 through 34 are pending, and all claims were rejected in the Office Action dated June 4, 2009. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's careful consideration of the arguments previously presented, and the matters raised in the current Office Action will be addressed in the same order herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

I. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,735,437 (Broyles et al.). Claims 20, 25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024353A1 (Peterson et al.). Finally, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,007,515 (Epstein et al.).

Claims 20, 22, 23, and 24 have all been recast as independent claims, to provide focus on several aspects of the present invention. Claim 20 includes the subject matter previously recited in claim 21, and claim 21 has been canceled. With the foregoing amendments, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants note with regard to Broyles et al. that the system set forth in claims 20, 22, 23, and 24 is adapted to mix the components together to provide a substance, which if it exists in Broyles et al. has not yet been identified. Moreover, the pistons of Broyles et al. were apparently equated with the pistons of the present invention, but were separately said to represent the claimed connection rod. Accordingly Broyles et al. is believed to lack either the claimed pistons or the claimed connection rod, and cannot anticipate the pending claims. Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims over Broyles et al. is respectfully requested.

With respect to Peterson et al., Applicants note that it does not disclose pistons for sealing at least two compartments, nor does it disclose the subject matter of claims 21 (now

incorporated into claim 20), 22, 23, or 24. Reconsideration of the rejection based on Peterson et al. is respectfully requested.

Finally, Epstein et al. does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 21 (now incorporated into claim 20), 22, 23, or 24, and accordingly the reconsideration of the rejection of those claims is respectfully requested as well.

II. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0060894A1 (Dai et al.). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0186190A1 (Lokhandwala et al.). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al. in view of Lokhandwala et al. Claims 28 through 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,544,233 (Fukui). Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0072123A1 (Simonton et al.). And finally, claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broyles et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,264,619 (Ferguson).

The four independent claims currently pending in the application are believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the primary references in each rejection noted above for at least the reasons pointed out in Section I above, and the secondary references are not believed to supply or suggest the disclosure missing from the primary references. For example, in regard to the invention of claim 21 (now claim 20), Dai et al. is not believed to disclose the features missing from Broyles et al., including the claimed pistons and connection rod as recited in claim 20. And Lokhandwala et al. is not believed to disclose the claimed pistons and connection rod recited in claim 20, nor the other features recited in the independent claims that are missing from Broyles et al. and from Epstein et al. Reconsideration of the obviousness rejections in view of the current claims is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

All outstanding rejections are believed to have been met and overcome, and a notice of allowance for all pending claims is respectfully solicited. If a telephone discussion with the Applicants' representative would be helpful in resolving any remaining matters related to this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 651-736-4050.

Respectfully submitted,

September 3, 2009

Date

Doc. # 738061

By: _____ /Peter L. Olson/

Peter L. Olson, Reg. No.: 35,308

Telephone No.: 651-736-4050

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833